| 1<br>2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9 | James Cai (SBN: 200189)  jcai@sacattorneys.com  Brian A. Barnhorst (SBN: 130292)  bbarnhorst@sacattorneys.com  Patrick E. O'Shaughnessy (SBN: 218051)  poshaughnessy@sacattorneys.com  Woody Wu (SBN: 309317)  wwu@sacattorneys.com  SAC ATTORNEYS LLP  1754 Technology Drive, Suite 122  San Jose, CA 95110  Telephone: (408) 436-0789  Jingjing Ye (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)  jye@yefirm.com  YE & ASSOCIATES, P.C.  500 N. Central Expy, #500  Plano, TX 75080  Telephone: (469) 410-5232 |  |
|---|--|--|
| 11<br>12                                  | Attorneys for Temujin Labs Inc. (Delaware) Temujin Labs Inc. (Cayman Islands), Lily Chao, and Damien Ding  |  |
| 13  | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT   |  |
| 14  | NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  |  |
| 15  |  |  |
| 16  | SAN JOSE DIVISION  |  |
| 17  | ARIEL ABITTAN,   | Case No. 20-CV-09340-NC  |
| 18  | Plaintiff,   | O'SHAUGHNESSY DECLARATION IN                                       |
| 19  | v.   | SUPPORT OF TEMUJIN'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S RULE                |
| 20  |  | 41(a)(2) MOTION TO DISMISS WITHOUT PREJUDICE, SEEKING              |
| 21 22                                     | LILY CHAO et al.,  | INSTEAD A DISMISSAL WITH<br>PREJUDICE OR SIGNIFICANT<br>CONDITIONS |
| 23  | Defendants.  | Judge: Hon. Nathanael Cousins                                      |
| 24  |  | Filed: December 24, 2020   |
| 25  |  | 7 Medi   |
| 26  |  |  |
| 27  |  |  |
| 28  | O'SHALIGHNESSY DECL ISO OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIEF'S  |  |

O'SHAUGHNESSY DECL. ISO OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S RULE 41(a)(2) MOTION, SEEKING INSTEAD DISMISSAL WITH PREJUDICE OR SIGNIFICANT CONDITIONS

I, Patrick O'Shaughnessy, declare,

- 1. I am an attorney licensed to practice law in the State of California. I serve as Of Counsel at SAC Attorneys LLP, counsel for Temujin Labs Inc., a Delaware Corporation, Temujin Labs Inc., a Cayman Islands Corporation, Lily Chao, and Damien Ding (collectively, "Temujin") in the above-captioned matter. I submit this declaration in support of Temujin's Opposition to Plaintiff's motion to dismiss his case without prejudice, seeking instead a dismissal with prejudice or significant conditions.
- 2. I possess personal knowledge of the facts set forth herein. If called as a witness, I could and would competently testify to them.
- 3. I conferred with Ms. Brianna Pierce, counsel for Mr. Abittan, on June 13, 2023 about Mr. Abittan's responses and objections to Temujin's April 28, 2023 discovery requests, and we substantially narrowed the scope of those requests to focus on the materials from which Plaintiff built his complaint in this case.
- 4. Ms. Pierce said then that her client planned to produce documents in response to these discovery requests if this Court entered a sufficient protective order. She subsequently updated me on the current status of the parties' negotiations on the proposed protective order.
- 5. Attached as Exhibit A is a true and correct copy of the email I sent to her on June 13, 2023 following that discussion.
- 6. I subsequently sought more information about the status of the parties' negotiations on the proposed protective order, and promptly followed up with Ms. Pierce to continue the negotiations.
- 7. Attached as Exhibit B is a true and correct copy of the email I sent to her on June 14, 2023 to follow up on the proposed protective order.
- 8. The remaining issue on the protective order negotiations was whether the documents may be shared across the pending federal and state lawsuits.
- 9. Attached as Exhibit C is a true and correct copy of the email I sent to Ms. Pierce and her colleague Mr. Constantine Economides on June 26, 2023 with a draft proposed

protective order attached, as well as a redline comparing it to the version Ms. Pierce previously sent me. 10. This draft reflects an apparent resolution of the remaining issue in the negotiations, i.e., it proposes to permit sharing of discovery in this case across the pending federal and state lawsuits reflected in the proposed order. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Dated: July 12, 2023 SAC ATTORNEYS LLP /s/ Patrick O'Shaughnessy Patrick O'Shaughnessy O'SHAUGHNESSY DECL. ISO OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S RULE 41(a)(2) MOTION, SEEKING INSTEAD DISMISSAL WITH PREJUDICE

OR SIGNIFICANT CONDITIONS